

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Alexandria Division

JOHN DOE,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 1:24-cv-2365 MSN/IDD
)	
CHRISTOPHER A. WRAY, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to Proceed in Pseudonym or, in the Alternative, for a Protective Order [Dkt. No. 5] (“Motion”). This matter can be resolved without oral argument, as such argument would not aid the decisional process. Upon consideration of the Motion, memorandum, and Rule 26(c)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it is hereby

ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to Proceed in Pseudonym is **DENIED**. Plaintiff has not sufficiently demonstrated that “the party’s stated interest in anonymity” outweighs “the public’s interest in openness and any prejudice that anonymity would pose to the opposing party.” *Doe v. Public Citizen*, 749 F.3d 246, 274 (4th Cir. 2014). It is further

ORDERED that the parties may file a joint protective order on this matter for this Court’s consideration. This Court finds that the information that Plaintiff seeks to keep confidential would be better protected via the entry of a protective order.

ENTERED this 31st day of January 2025.

Alexandria, Virginia

/s/

Ivan D. Davis
United States Magistrate Judge